

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*JW*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/182,297	10/29/98	WEINSTEIN	R WEINR40062

021587
MORSE & ALTMAN
73 TREMONT STREET
BOSTON MA 02108

HM12/0617

EXAMINER

TRAVERS, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1614	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/99 3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/182,297	Applicant(s) Weinstein et al
	Examiner RUSSELL TRAVERS	Group Art Unit 1614

Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Claims 1-36 are presented for examination.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines "coordinated administration instructions instructing the coordinated use of said dosage units according to the said regimen".

Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, no "coordinated administration instructions instructing the coordinated use of said dosage units according to the said regimen" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "coordinated administration instructions instructing the coordinated use of said dosage units according to the said regimen", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1-36
Claim ~~14~~ is rendered indefinite by the phrase "coordinated administration instructions instructing the coordinated use of said dosage units according to the said regimen" and thereby failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Criteria defining those situations where "coordinated administration instructions instructing the coordinated use of said dosage units according to the said regimen" are not set forth in the specification, thereby failing to provide information defining the instant inventions metes and bounds. Applicant's phrase fails to clearly define the subject matter encompassed by the instant claims, thus is properly

rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Knudsen or

Weinstein.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Gwaltney,

Vilkov et al and Applicants' admission of record, in view of Knudsen and Weinstein.

Gwaltney, Vilkov et al and Applicants' admit on the record teach the claimed compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. This medicament is taught as useful for treating various rhinitis symptoms, as herein claimed. Claims 7-8, 10, 12-13, 15, 25-26 and 30-31, and the primary references, differ as to:

- 1) the concomitant employment of these medicaments, and
- 2) administration methods for the medicaments.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of conventional anti-histamine, and decongestant agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

The presented claims specifically require conventional pharmaceutical compositions. The skilled artisan would have seen conventional medicament compositions, and the administration of these conventional compositions, by conventional means as residing in the skilled artisan purview.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.



Russell Travers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614